



02-03-03

3643

M. E. 2/13/03
2/19

Response to Office Action mailed November 4, 2002
for Patent #10/083/771 Inventor Huey Thomas Crochet

Kurt Rowan, Examiner
Art Unit 3643 regarding application 10/083/771
Filed 2/27/2002 by Huey Thomas Crochet

RECEIVED
FEB 05 2003

The applicant responds to examiners citations as follows,

GROUP 3600

1. Citation - the means by which said angle slips to one side is confusing.

Applicant's response - claims 6-8 are requested to be cancelled and substituted by 9 and 10 wherein said angle is defined as a smoothly rounded, obliquely inclined spin means whereby impact through collision with obstacles while being retrieved causes said angle to slip to one side initiating said spin by said weight.

2. Citation - the limitation "the tip" in line 6 of claim 6 has insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant's response - the description of invention section reads as follows,

Lay the weight on its side and drill a 1/8-inch hole so that 1/16 of an inch of metal is between the hole and the "tip" of the 1-1/2 inch angled end.

3. Citation - the limitation "the level of clearance" in lines 13-14 has insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant's response - the operation of invention section wherein the level of clearance is the level of line attachment.

4. Citation - claim 6 is rejected as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Bennet as merely replacing one means of line attachment for an equivalent means and the function remains the same.

Applicant's response - the applicant submits that the weight of the office acting has a hole to allow the protuberance free surface of the hemisphere head to have maximum exposure to obstacles for the best chance of responding to intense applied force to the line through slippage in actual snag situations, which is further explained in Citation 5.

5. Citation - Adams in view of Bennet and further in view of Stephenson, which has a fishing weight mounted on a shaft having o-rings at each end and a swivel attached at one end.

Applicant's response - the applicant submits that the o-ring of the office action is not peripherally attached to anything, and if desired could be turned around the periphery through the hole to complete 360 degrees.

The applicant further submits that the o-ring of the office action fits loosely through the hole and has the ability to be pulled across the end of the hemisphere head either forward or back for exposing said head to an obstacle in actual snag situations to give said weight the best opportunity to respond to intensely applied force from the line.

The applicant further submits that the designed operation of the hemisphere head allowed by said o-ring gives the weight of the office action a distinct advantage over the prior art in actual snag situations.

6. Citation - Obviousness of swivel in view of Adams as modified by Bennet and further in view of Stephenson.

Applicant's response - the applicant submits that the circumstance of line twist is an obvious result of the operation and design of the applicants invention and such was anticipated by the integral attachment of a swivel for the purpose of eliminating said twisting and if said attachments were omitted, a serious flaw of design and operation would have been committed. However, since such circumstances were anticipated, due to the design necessity of the spin, the applicant submits that the swivel is a necessary and integral part of the design, operation, and function as a whole. The applicant further submits that Adams teaches specifically away from spinning, as stated immediately adjacent median number 20 of the summary, and the use of attachment means other than the line is unnecessary and constitutes a redundancy of operation and design whereas the line attachment apparatus of the office action is crucial to designed operation with each of the two parts playing separate and important roles relating to snag-resistance and elimination of line twist imperative to achieving the final goal of snag-resistant operation on a horizontal plane allowing for fast steady retrieves through stump and brush laden areas with said snag resistance, horizontal plane of operation, and fast retrieves being objects of the weight of the office action.

Fast, steady retrieves from long casts is stated in the abstract, and fast retrieves is stated in Objects and Advantages of the weight of the office action as is snag resistance and horizontal plane of operation.

7. Citation - in reference to claim 8, the use of the same materials used to make 6-inch nails is cited as obvious because the suitability of a material is based on its intended use.

Applicant's response - the statement of the use of the same material used to make 6-inch nails in claim 8 is one to further define the structure of the body of the weight.

8. Citation - Grimes shows a fishing rig with a weight and a swivel connecting the line to a hook.

Applicant's response - the field of the invention of the Grimes patent reads as follows,

The present invention relates to fishing apparatus and more particularly to a stop for use with fishing rigs with sliding weights.

The applicant submits that Grimes is non-analogous to the weight of the office action as the hole near the end of the weight and the swivel are responded to in citations 4 and 6, and the weight of the office action is attached at the end of the line.